

REMARKS

The Final Office Action dated October 20, 2003 and the Advisory Action dated March 12, 2004 have been considered.

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Asai* (U.S. Patent No. 5,593,710; previously of record).

The Examiner is thanked for indicating that claims 5 and 7-8 are allowed.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

By this amendment claims 1 and 3 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1 and 3 still remain pending for further consideration while claims 5 and 7-8 are allowed.

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

While Applicants respectfully disagree with the comments of the Advisory Action, the limitation in claim 1 of “the temperature of said conduction member is different from that of said mold bodies” and the limitation in claim 3 of “the temperature of said conduction means is

different from that of said mold bodies” have been deleted as shown in newly-amended claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, has been rendered moot.

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on *Asai*

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Asai*. Applicants respectfully submit that newly-amended claims 1 and 3 include features not found or taught in *Asai*.

The Advisory Action states that a center bushing 72 of *Asai* can serve as a heat suppressing member to suppress heat conducted through the cutter from being transmitted to the mold body-mirror block. However, Applicants respectfully submit that *Asai* neither teaches nor suggests the claimed combination including at least that “the pair of mold bodies and the conduction member are structurally separated by the first heat suppressing member,” as recited by newly-amended claim 1.

In the instant application, as shown in the exemplary embodiment of Fig. 1, a molding bodies 101 and a sprue 109 are structurally separated by an annular ring 2 (corresponding to the first heat suppressing member as claimed). In contrast, *Asai* fails to teach or suggest any structure in which a sprue bushing 22 and a molding body 70 are structurally separated by the center bushing 72, which allegedly corresponds to the first heat suppressing member as claimed.

Similarly, Applicants respectfully submit that *Asai* neither teaches nor suggests the claimed combination including at least that “the pair of mold bodies and the conduction means are structurally separated by the first heat suppressing means,” as recited by newly-amended claim 3.

As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, a claim is anticipated by a prior art reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 should be withdrawn because *Asai* does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 1 and 3, as newly amended.

With no other rejection pending, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1, 3, 5, 7 and 8 are in condition for allowance.

Conclusions


In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants’ undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By:


Robert J. Goodell
Reg. No.: 41,040

Dated: March 22, 2004

Customer No. 009629

MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

202-739-3000 (phone)

202-739-3001 (fax)